

TEKER TORRES & TEKER, P.C.
130 Aspinall Avenue-Suite 2A
Hagåtña, Guam 96910
671.477.9891 Telephone
671.472.2601 Facsimile

UNPINGCO & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Sinajana Mall-Suite 12B
Sinajana, Guam
671.475.8545 Telephone
671.475.8550 Facsimile

SHORE CHAN BRAGALONE LLP
SUITE 4450
325 N. ST. PAUL STREET
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201
TELEPHONE: (214) 593-9110
FACSIMILE: (214) 593-9111

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Nanya Technology Corp. and
Nanya Technology Corp. U.S.A.

FILED
DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

FEB - 9 2007 *mba*

MARY L.M. MORAN
CLERK OF COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF GUAM

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORP. AND
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORP. U.S.A.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FUJITSU LIMITED AND FUJITSU
MICROELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-06-00025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, JOSEPH C. RAZZANO, ESQ., hereby declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of majority and am competent to testify regarding the matters stated herein.

2. I hereby certify that on February 9, 2007, a true and exact copy of **PLAINTIFFS'**

ORIGINAL

parties failed to reach an agreement.¹⁰ Plaintiffs subsequently filed a motion with the Court requesting the Court enter a protective order before any documents are exchanged.¹¹ Further, the objection that such information is not likely to produce admissible evidence is completely inaccurate because the requested documents would demonstrate that Defendants are subject to this Court's jurisdiction. Defendants' duplicative objections that such requests are irrelevant, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague and ambiguous are again improper, evasive and objectively unreasonable.

The combination of Defendants' objections to these categories of documents and the preceding outlined categories and Defendants' failure to submit any affidavits or evidence substantiating these objections simply establish their obstructionist, boilerplate, and frivolous nature. The Court should not countenance such abusive discovery tactics.

IV.

CONCLUSION

Because of FMA's unwillingness to provide substantive responses to Plaintiffs' discovery requests, Plaintiffs file this supplement respectfully requesting that the Court overrule FMA's objections and compel FMA to provide substantive responses to Plaintiffs' discovery requests.

Dated: February 9, 2007

TEKER TORRES & TEKER, P.C.

By: 
JOSEPH C. RAZZANO, ESQ.
Attorneys For Plaintiffs
Nanya Technology Corp. and
Nanya technology Corp. U.S.A.

¹⁰ See Exhibit C, Letters from Michael Murray to Alfonso Chan.

¹¹ It was only after several letters and after Plaintiffs' requested deadline did Defendants provide comments to Plaintiffs regarding the proposed protective order. By that time, after several weeks of waiting for Defendants' comments, Plaintiffs had already sought assistance from the Court.